DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 276 062 CS 210 196

AUTHOR Teichman, Milton; Poris, Marilyn
TITLE Wordprocessing in the Classroom: Its Effects on Freshman Writers.
PUB DATE [85]
NOTE 59p.; Funding provided by Marist College and a study contract from the IBM Corporation.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Computer Assisted Instruction; *Freshman Composition; Higher Education; Learning Strategies; *Word Processing; *Writing Apprehension; Writing Evaluation; *Writing Improvement; *Writing Instruction; Writing Research

ABSTRACT

To learn more about the impact of word processing on the writing of college freshmen, a 2-year study involving 320 students of average writing ability investigated whether (1) students using word processors write significantly better than those who do not; (2) manipulating and improving sentences on a screen affects students' awareness of grammar, sentence structure, and idiom of standard written English; (3) students using word processors demonstrate a distinctive pattern of writing improvement; (4) word processing affects writing anxiety; and (5) a particular subgroup (men/women, resident students/commuters, or students with computer experience/without experience) is more likely to benefit from the use of word processing. Results indicated that the use of word processing significantly enhanced students' essays. Statistics revealed a pattern of spurts in the progress of these students. Findings showed that using computers significantly reduced writing apprehension while significantly increasing a student's ability to recognize standard written English. Scores indicated that commuters performed best using word processors. Finally, results indicated that computer intervention in the form of a spelling check inhibited spelling performance, though it did not affect writing apprehension. (Appendixes include syllabi for the courses "College Writing 107" and "Rhetoric 108," a two-part writing placement/proficiency examination, grading material, and a student questionnaire.) (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED276062

WORDPROCESSING IN THE CLASSROOM: ITS EFFECTS ON FRESHMAN WRITERS

Milton Teichman

Marilyn Poris

Marist College

Poughkeepsie, New York 12601

(914) 471-3240

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Milton Teichman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 210 196

ABSTRACT

Eight instructors at Marist College, working together over a period of two years (four semesters) with approximately 320 freshman of average writing ability, conducted a number of controlled experiments to learn more about the impact of wordprocessing and related writing aids on freshman essay writing. Overall effectiveness of completed student essays was judged according to agreed upon criteria. Analysis of Variance, Repeated Measures, and Regression Analysis were the statistical tests employed to analyze data.

Results: 1. In three out of four semesters, the use of wordprocessing significantly enhanced the writing of essays as measured. In no instance did the use of the computer worsen writing. 2. The use of wordprocessing appears to impact on the pattern of essay-writing performance, altering it from linear to curvilinear-- that is, showing more spurts of progress. 3. In three out of four semesters, the use of word processing significantly reduced writing apprehension as measured. In no instance, did the use of the computer increase writing apprehension. 4. In three out of four semesters, students using wordprocessing showed a significantly increased ability to recognize Standard Written English on an objective test. Again, in no instance did the use of the computer diminish this ability. 5. Of the sub-groups studied (men/women, resident students/commuters, computer experience/no computer experience), commuters (non-resident students) performed best using word-processing. 6. Computer intervention in the form of a spelling check may inhibit spelling performance. 7. Computer intervention in the form of a spelling check, thesaurus, and style check ("Proof") does not appear to change writing apprehension.

This article discusses the process by which these results were obtained, the implications of these results, and suggests possibilities for future research.

WORDPROCESSING IN THE CLASSROOM: ITS EFFECTS ON FRESHMAN WRITERS

MILTON TEICHMAN
MARILYN PORIS
Marist College

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, much has been written about the psychic and physical advantages of wordprocessing for student writers (i.e., Schwartz, 1982; Daiute, 1983; Bean, 1983; Feldman, 1984). However, as Bridwell, Nancarrow and Ross (1984) have observed in their review of the literature on the subject, there has been little research to substantiate claims for the new writing tool. Similarly, Jeanette Harris (1985), speaking of the "extravagant and largely unsubstantiated claims" made for wordprocessing, states: "Few existing studies provide useful information about how word processing affects student writing...." Indeed, so great has been the enthusiasm for the new writing tool that few teachers have asked, for example, whether adding the additional anxiety of computer facility to the writing process might encumber or even hinder the student in essay writing. To address the need for more empirical research on the advantages and limitations of wordprocessing in the classroom, eight instructors at Marist College conducted a number of experiments from the Fall of 1983 to the Spring of 1985 to learn more about the impact of wordprocessing on student writers-- in this case, freshman of average writing ability. Freshmen participants were given access to IBM 3279 terminals linked to an IBM 4341 mainframe computer for a two-semester writing requirement. Participants learned to use a file editor called XEDIT and a formatting program called Waterloo Script. They printed their essays on IBM 3287 matrix printers.

Over the two-year period, answers were sought to five main questions:

1. Do freshmen who use wordprocessing write significantly better essays than those who do not use this aid? Student revisions were not examined in this study. Rather, the overall effectiveness of completed

student essays was judged according to specific, agreed upon criteria (see page 5). In short, do freshmen who write, revise, and print on computers write stronger essays than students using pens, pencils and typewriters?

If wordprocessing enhances freshman writing, there are important implications for the teaching of writing on the college level.

2. Does manipulating and improving sentences on a screen rather than on paper make the student more or less alert to the grammar, sentence structure and idiom of standard written English --the English, that is, of most college textbooks and the English students are expected to use in essays for most college courses? Will the student who writes and revises on the computer be better or less able than his or her traditional counterpart to recognize standard written English as measured by a standardized objective test? If the computer does increase recognition of standard written English, there are again important instructional implications.

3. Will students writing several essays on the computer in a given semester show a different pattern of progress or growth compared to students writing with conventional tools? For example, will their progress be linear or curvilinear? Will they show earlier or later progress in writing than students using conventional tools? Answers to these questions may have ramifications for the teaching of writing.

4. Does wordprocessing reduce or increase writing anxiety in college freshmen? Teachers of writing, journalism, and related fields frequently deal with students who find writing an uncomfortable, punishing, and even fearful experience. Indeed, the typical textbook frequently offers advice to students on gaining confidence in writing. Studies have shown that apprehension about writing is widespread among student writers, that it is a condition that can impede students in their academic work, discourage them from electing advanced writing courses, influence choice of major, and have far-reaching consequences with regard to career choice and self-image (Daly and Miller, 1975; Daly and Shamo, 1976, 1978; Richmond and Dickson, 1980; Selfe, 1981). A review of the literature shows that there has been no empirical study of the effect of the computer on writing apprehension. Will students who write with computers show significantly less or more anxiety about writing than those who write with conventional tools? If computer technology can help reduce writing anxiety, such technology may contribute to better overall academic performance (even for strong writers), increase career options, and encourage students to write more freely when not required to by course assignments.

5. Among the freshmen of average writing ability assigned to "College Writing" and the follow-up course "Rhetoric" (80% of the freshman class), is there a group that is likely to benefit most from wordprocessing (men or women, resident students or commuters, students with some computer experience or those without)? Given limited computer resources for a freshman class of about 600 students and the need to make best use of those resources, which students, if any, are likely to benefit most from writing essays on computer terminals? Which students

should receive priority access to computers for writing? If such a "best fit" group exists, what are the implications for longitudinal study?

This study, conducted over a period of four semesters, consists of four phases. For each phase, this article will present the specific objectives (questions to be answered) the process employed, the results obtained, and the conclusions reached. The presentation of the four phases will be followed by a summary of results for the two-year period, a discussion of those results, and an enumeration of questions suggested for future research.

The findings of this study may contribute modestly to an understanding of what wordprocessing can and cannot do for student writers and may be useful to teachers and departments considering the introduction of computer technology into their writing programs.

PHASE 1, FALL 1983

OBJECTIVES

In Phase 1, answers were sought to the following questions:

1. Is there a significant difference with regard to quality of writing between freshmen who use wordprocessing in composition and those who use traditional writing tools?

2. Is there a significant difference between the two groups with regard to the recognition of standard written English?

3. Is the performance pattern significantly different between the two groups?

4. Is there a significant difference between the two groups with regard to writing apprehension?

5. Are there performance differences between men and women who use wordprocessing for the writing of essays?

PROCESS

To answer these questions, 8 classes (160 students) were randomly selected from 16 sections of "College Writing." Students were assigned to "College Writing" on the basis of their SAT verbal scores, their high-school English record, and a Placement Essay Exam. "College Writing"is designed for freshmen of average writing ability.

The Experimental group consisted of 80 freshmen (one-half the selected group) in 4 classes of 20 who composed, revised, and printed their essays on the computer. The Control group consisted of 80 freshmen in 4 classes who composed and revised their essays with pens, pencils, and typewriters. While students in the Experimental Group were writing their essays in a Writing Lab set aside for them only, students in the Control Group wrote in traditional environments.

Participating instructors were selected on the basis of their interest in the project and their willingness to work as team members. All eight classes followed the same syllabus, designed by the instructors involved in the project (see Appendix A). Reading and writing assignments were the same across the eight classes. Students read contemporary essays on a range of subjects having a strong humanistic aspect: on the values we live by, on obedience to authority, on the impact of fairy tales on children, on morality and the movies. Their essay assignments required them to respond to those readings. Participating instructors agreed to adopt similar teaching approaches. These stressed revision, peer criticism in small groups, and individual conferences between student

and instructor. A pervasive aspect of the course involved the examination of values issues. To encourage consistency of instruction across the eight sections, instructors followed the same session-by session outline.

Instructors in the Experimental classes departed from this outline by devoting three hours of class time during the first two weeks of the semester to teach their students wordprocessing. Relatively new to wordprocessing themselves, they taught their students only what they needed to know to compose, revise, and print the required course essays. While these students were learning wordprocessing, their counterparts in the Control group were moving ahead with the work of the course. Students in the Experimental group were thus three hours behind in actual course instruction. None of the students in the Experimental classes had a prior knowledge of wordprocessing, though a number had a rudimentary experience with computers in high school.

To support students in learning wordprocessing as quickly as possible, instructors devised a simple instruction manual and also trained several upperclassmen to serve as monitors in the Writing Lab. The eighty students in the Experimental group had access to twenty terminals from 8:00 AM to midnight every day except Sunday. Students did not experience either a shortage of terminals or insufficient access to the Writing Lab where terminals were housed. If revision was to be stressed as a vital aspect of the course, then students had to be provided with enough time on the computer.

One student was intimidated by the new medium and requested a transfer to a non-computer section of College Writing. At mid-semester, one student dropped out of an Experimental section for reasons unrelated to the computer.

Tests and Scoring:

Three pre-test scores and post-test scores were generated.

1. Placement/Proficiency Essay and Post-Essay Test

One pre-test was the freshman Placement/Proficiency Essay (hereafter referred to as the Pre-Essay Test)--the primary basis for student assignment to "College Writing". The Post-Essay Test was actually the Final Essay Exam for the course. For each of these tests, the student was required to read an extended passage and then to formulate and develop a thesis in response to the passage. (See Appendix B). Each essay test was two hours long and hand written. The Post-Essay Test was hand written, despite the Experimental Group's semester-long experience on the computer, in order the match the conditions of the Pre-Essay Test. Each essay test was graded by two instructors other than the student's course instructor, thereby generating a composite score range of 2-12. Instructors agreed upon criteria for grading these essay tests and came together for a practice grading session prior to actual grading. Criteria were the same used for the evaluation of the course

essays discussed below (see page 5).

2. Test of Standard Written English (TSWE) (Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey)

The second pre-test/post-test was an objective test of fifty multiple-choice questions which measure the student's ability to recognize standard written English--the language of most textbooks, periodicals, and newspapers, and the language students are expected to use in essays they write in most of their college courses. The pre and post test were parallel forms of the same test. (See Appendix C for sample questions.) The pre-test was administered during the first week of the semester, the post-test during the last week.

3. Writing Apprehension Test (WAT)

The third pre-test/post-test was a twenty-six item instrument (reliability coefficient .921) developed by John A Daly and Michael Miller and is described in their study "The Empirical Development of an Instrument to Measure Writing Apprehension" (Daly, 1975). Daly, a recognized specialist in the field of writing apprehension, has written extensively on the subject. The Writing Apprehension Test (see Appendix D) measures the degree to which an individual associates writing with fear, anxiety, and failure, or with pleasure, satisfaction, and success. The student is asked to agree with, disagree with, or state his/her uncertainty about statements like the following:

I avoid writing.
I have no fear of my writing being evaluated.
I look forward to writing down my ideas.
I am afraid of writing essays.
Taking a composition course is a very frightening experience.
Handing in a composition makes me feel good.

Scores on this test can range from a low of 26 (high apprehension) to a high of 130 (low apprehension). The Daly-Miller measure has been used with college students, high-school students, grade schoolers, and adults (Daly, 1985). The pre-test was administered during the first week of the semester, the post-test during the last. Pre and post tests were identical. Test sensitivity (the ability of students to recall specific questions) was considered non-critical because of the interval between tests.

Essay Assignments:

In addition to the three pre and post tests, a series of six essays were assigned during the semester. For each essay, the student received numerical sub-scores in Content, Organization, Sentence Structure, Diction, and Mechanics (comprising grammar punctuation,and spelling). The eight instructors in the project established written criteria for evaluating student essays in the five dimensions mentioned above. For each of the five dimensions, they specified the qualities that characterize strong performance (conventionally regarded as A-B).

satisfactory performance (C), and poor performance (D-F). Students in both groups received copies of these criteria and were thus made aware of how their essays were being judged. (See Appendix E for written criteria of evaluation.)

Instructors did not use letter grades. On a rating sheet attached to each student essay, they assigned a score ranging from 1 (very poor) to 7 (excellent) for student performance in each of the five dimensions being evaluated. (See Appendix F for rating sheet.) The highest cumulative score for an essay was 35; the lowest, 7. Instructors met for practice grading sessions on the average of every two weeks during the semester in an effort to maintain uniform grading standards.

This cooperative effort appears to have been successful since an inter-rater reliability of .94 was calculated using Cronbach's alpha coefficient. One instructor, not inclined to work in a team context, had to be replaced. The rest of the team remained intact throughout the two-year period of the study and continued to meet regularly for practice grading to refine the application of the criteria. Apart from the question of the impact of the computer on writing, faculty experienced this interaction in the area of grading as highly significant. They agreed that such interaction focused their attention on the complex issue of evaluation and, in general, honed their skills as teachers of writing.

Essay writing required students to synthesize, analyze, or critique their readings-- intellectual activities most often required in the liberal arts curriculum. (See Appendix A for specific essay assignments.) The student had two weeks to complete each essay. To encourage revision, each instructor required that a preliminary draft be submitted after the first week of the two-week period. Students using the computer submitted computer printouts of their preliminary drafts. Students in the Control Group submitted handwritten or typed preliminary drafts.

The greater part of class discussion revolved around randomly selected student papers in their preliminary draft form. In the course of the semester, each student had at least one paper discussed. Selected papers were distributed to class members in mimeographed form or projected on to a screen for either small-group or full-class discussion. Students and instructors commented on strengths and weaknesses of a given draft in the light of the criteria of evaluation mentioned above. Discussion of particular papers in their preliminary form gave students ideas for the further revision of their own work. Students were given one additional week to refine their papers before submitting their final drafts. During this second week, a class session was again devoted, wholly or in part, to discussion of student work in the next stage of composition. Through frequent discussion, in class and in individual conferences, of work in progress, students experienced the idea that successful writing is, in fact, rewriting. It should be mentioned that tough grading standards, in terms of a rigorous application of the criteria of evaluation, further encouraged students to revise their work.

To answer questions 1, 2, and 4 posed for Phase 1 (see above, p. 3), analyses of variance were employed. A Repeated Measures analysis was used to address question 3. An alpha level of .05 was used to determine significance in all the statistical tests employed.

RESULTS

Here, as in subsequent phases, the presentation of results will be followed by a section on conclusions in which the implications of the results will be discussed.

Pre-Test Scores:

Group pre-test scores were compared to assess the standing of each group at the outset. Though classes were randomly selected, an Analysis of Variance (Anova) indicated a significant difference between the two groups on the Essay pre-test (Placement Test). The Experimental group was the weaker of the two.

An Analysis of Variance indicated no significant difference between the two groups on the Test of Standard Written English (TSWE) or on the Writing Apprehension Test (WAT).

Pre-to-Post Scores:

Pre-test to post-test scores within each group were analyzed to determine group change.

The Experimental Group yielded significantly better scores on the Essay Post-Test (Anova) than they did on the pre-test. The Control Group did not change significantly.

For the six required essays, neither group showed greater gains from Essay 1 to Essay 6 in the areas of Content (CON), Organization (ORG), Sentence Structure (SS), Diction (DIC), and Mechanics (MECH), as determined by an Anova. It should be remembered that essays 1 and 6 are not the pre and post Essay Tests referred to above. Essays 1 and 6 are used for dimension comparison (CON, ORG, SS, etc.) since the pre and post Essay Tests were scored holistically and did not generate scores for the several dimensions.

Though the Experimental Group evidenced a greater actual gain than did the Control Group from pre to post Test of Standard English, neither group demonstrated a significant difference from pre to post TSWE.

The Experimental Group yielded a positive change in apprehension from pre to post (that is, less apprehension), whereas the Control Group yielded a negative change. However, this pattern must be considered

chance, for neither group generated a statistically significant change (Anova) with regard to the pre and post Apprehension Test.

Post-Test Scores:

Post test scores (like the pre-test scores) were analyzed to determine differences between the two groups.

There was no significant difference (Anova) between the two groups in their scores on the Essay Post-Test. We recall that the Experimental Group was significantly weaker on the Essay Pre-Test; therefore, no difference in scores on the Essay Post-Test indicates a greater gain for the Experimental Group.

There was no significant difference between the two groups in their scores on the Post-Test of Standard English.

There was no significant difference between the two groups in their scores on the Post-Writing Apprehension Test.

Comparison of Performance on Six Course Essays:

There was no significant difference between the two groups in the areas of Content, Organization, Sentence Structure, and Diction when using sums of scores attained for all six essays on each dimension. A significant difference appeared in the area of Mechanics, in which the Control Group was the stronger group. A mean of the sum scores for each dimension across the six essays appears below in Table 1.

Table 1

Cumulative Mean Scores in Five Dimensions of Essay Writing, Both Groups

Dimension	Experimental Group	Control Group
CON	23.0	23.1
ORG	23.2	23.0
SS	22.4	23.5
DIC	22.1	23.7
MECH	18.5	21.3

Repeated Measures Analysis:

The two groups revealed disparate performance curves. Regardless of the overall gain made, the Control Group exhibited general linear progression for all dimensions scored, whereas the Experimental Group exhibited much greater curvilinearity. The performance pattern, as scored, showed a greater number of spurts and plateaus for the

Experimental Group, which ultimately yielded greater gain.

In addition, the Experimental Group tended to show significant progress across the five dimensions earlier than the Control Group did (that is, in essays 2 and 3). For whatever reasons, however, it was unable to sustain growth between assignments 5 and 6 so as to end the semester with a final spurt of progress. What caused slackening at the end of the semester? This finding has implications for future research.

Performance Differences, Men/Women:

Additional tests were performed to begin to generate a "best fit" student profile. Were some sub-sets of students using the computer doing better than others, the variance of which was lost when examining the two groups at large? In Phase 1, we focused on possible differences between males and females. In later phases, we focused on other sub-groups. Were men, who generally attain higher SAT math scores than women and who are generally socialized to be more receptive to science and technology, performing better in the Experimental Group than women? An analysis of variance showed no significant differences between males and females with regard to

a. Essay Pre-test
b. Essay Post-test
c. Writing Apprehension Pre-test
d. Writing Apprehension Post-test
e. Performance in Content, Organization, Sentence structure, Diction, and Mechanics on six essays
f. SAT verbal scores
g. Post-Test of Standard Written English

There proved to be significant differences between males and females in two areas only: SAT math scores and the Pre-Test of Standard Written English. Females had lower SAT math scores and higher PreTest of Standard English scores. According to these results, males showed greater improvement as measured by the Test of Standard Written English. In actual writing performance, there was no significant difference between men and women in the Experimental Group.

CONCLUSIONS AND RESULTING QUESTIONS

Conclusions:

1. In one area only did the Experimental group significantly outperform the Control group. Beginning as a weaker group on the Pre-Essay Test, the Experimental Group scored as well as the Control Group on the Post-Essay test and thus demonstrated significant progress. The Control Group did not show significant progress from pre to post Essay Test.

Because students in the Experimental Group had the task of learning wordprocessing, and because they were confined to a single location for writing essays, their significant progress from pre to post essay may assume added meaning. Still, the greater progress of the Experimental Group must also be seen as a possible "Hawthorne" effect.

No significant difference between the two groups was found in the areas of Content, Organization, Sentence Structure, and Diction. The Control Group was significantly stronger in the area of Mechanics. Thus, clearly superior performance of the Experimental Group on the six essays of the course could not be demonstrated. On the other hand, if, on the basis of the Pre-Test Essay, we assume that the Experimental Group began as the weaker group, then no significant differences in four out of five dimensions of essay writing implies greater progress for the Experimental Group. The question is how much weight can be given to a single Pre-test Essay?

Though a positive conclusion appears evident, a significant difference between the two groups on post scores was needed to confirm our findings. Further study had to employ equal groups to start.

2. There was no significant difference between the groups, pre or post, for the Test of Standard Written English. This time the groups were equal at the start, and the results do not support the hypothesis. Writing and revising on the computer for a one-semester period does not appear to encourage fuller recognition of Standard Written English on an objective test. Neither does it diminish recognition.

3. Trend analysis revealed dissimilar growth patterns for the two groups. Is this a generalizable condition or is it unique to the single situation? Replication in this area was called for.

4. There was no significant difference between the two groups in writing apprehension. Nor was there a significant difference within each group from pre to post WAT scores. But since the direction of the scores for the Experimental Group was positive, whereas the direction for the Control Group was negative, further investigation was called for.

5. Regarding a "best fit" between the computer and a particular group of student writers, no significant difference was found in the writing performance of males and females in the Experimental Group. Here, too, replication was called for.

Questions:

The question of TIME: Does it take more than a semester for students to use fully the resources of the text editor to improve essay writing--in particular, to engage in the kind of revision that goes beyond words and phrases and is more substantive than cosmetic (Pufahl, 1984)? Does it take more than a semester with the text editor to significantly reduce writing anxiety? Would a longitudinal study, therefore, be the best test of the effectiveness of wordprocessing in improving writing and

lowering writing apprehension? Would such a study, furthermore, reduce the distortions that come from the novelty or frustrations of learning wordprocessing, the excitement of participating in an "experiment," and other variables that come into play?

PHASE 2, SPRING 1984

OBJECTIVES

In Phase 2, answers were sought to the following questions:

1. Would a help mechanism called "Proof" added to wordprocessing make a difference in in the quality of student essays? "Proof" is an IBM program working in conjunction with the file editor XEDIT that offers the user a spelling check, a thesaurus, and a phrase check. The spelling check, when invoked, highlights misspelled words and typos and offers one or more correctly spelled words as alternatives. The user can request a list of synonyms from the thesaurus simply by placing the cursor under the word in question in the text. The phrase check, when invoked, highlights awkward and wordy expressions, slang, cliches, jargon, and offers alternatives on request. The recommendations of "Proof" need not be accepted. When accepted, they can easily be incorporated into the writer's text. It should be mentioned that "Proof" does not offer assistance in grammar. "Proof" may well be the forerunner of a number of proofreading and style aids that have recently appeared on the market for use with the personal computer (Geist, 1985).

2. Do students in an Experimental Group with access to "Proof" become more competent spellers after a single semester than students in a Control Group using traditional ways of identifying spelling errors: namely, asking others how to spell a word, having others read the essay for spelling errors, or consulting a dictionary?

3. Does "Proof" added to wordprocessing reduce writing apprehension? In Phase 1, we saw a positive direction for the Experimental Group, though its gain was not significant. In Phase 2, we hypothesized certain variables impacting on writing apprehension, among them the student's perception of himself as weak in spelling, grammar, and vocabulary, and given to awkward and imprecise expression. We imagined previous teachers marking up student papers primarily in these areas. "Proof" gives the student the chance to eliminate a range of irregularities in spelling, vocabulary, and usage before the teacher examines and grades the essay. Specifically, do students in the Experimental Group using "Proof" show less writing apprehension than students in the Control Group?

In the spirit of replication, the following additional questions were asked:

4. Does manipulating and improving sentences on a screen rather than on paper make the student more or less alert to the grammar, sentence structure, and idiom of Standard Written English? (In Phase 1, we recall, writing essays on the computer did not appear to encourage fuller recognition of Standard Written English as measured by an objective test.)

5. Will students writing and revising essays on the computer show a linear or a curvilinear pattern of progress or growth? (In Phase 1, we recall, the pattern for those writing with computers was curvilinear.)

6. Is there a difference in the writing performance of men and women using the computer? (In phase 1, we recall, no significant difference was found.)

PROCESS

Only the Experimental Group of the previous semester remained basically intact for further study. Motivated by a desire to continue using the computer for writing, 90% of the students in the Experimental Group elected to remain with their instructors in computer sections of the follow-up course "Rhetoric." On the other hand, only 50% of the students in the Control Group elected to remain with the same instructors for the second semester course in "Rhetoric." This precluded the use of a control groupin Phase 2. As a consequence, experiments in Phase 2 involved four classes of 18 students each in which all students made use of wordprocessing.

Students in these classes continued to build on concepts and skills acquired in "College Writing" and were introduced, in addition, to the writing of a research paper. All four classes followed the same syllabus, designed by the participating instructors. (See Appendix G.) Reading and writing assignments were the same for the four classes, as were teaching approaches which again stressed revision, peer criticism in small groups, individual conferences between student and instructor, and values clarification. The four instructors continued to meet every two weeks for practice grading sessions of student essays in relation to the previously agreed upon criteria of evaluation.

To learn whether "Proof" has a positive impact on the quality of student writing, the four classes were divided into an Experimental and Control Group of two classes each. The Experimental Group made use of wordprocessing plus "Proof" in all essay writing. The Control Group made use of wordprocessing only.

A standardized spelling test was administered at the beginning and end of the semester to assess the impact of Proof" on spelling competence. This spelling test of fifty words, designed for college students and developed by Joan G. Roloff and Roslyn Snow, appears in their book Spelling (Glencoe Publishing Co., 1980). A Pearson-product moment correlation analysis yielded the following test-retest reliability coefficients: Phonics .95; General .97; Total .98.

The same pre-post analyses of variance were employed, by group, on the Essay Test, the Test of Standard Written English, and the Writing Apprehension Test. Post scores attained the prior semester were used as Spring pre scores since there was minimal time intervention.

As in Phase 1, Repeated Measures tests were employed to observe performance patterns on the required essays of the course--this time four essays of approximately 500 words and one research paper of approximately 20000 words.

RESULTS

Pre-test and post-test scores were used for the same purposes described in Phase 1: to learn where groups stood in relation to each other at the beginning of the semester; to learn about the progress made by each group; and to learn where groups stood in relation to each other at the end of the semester.

Pre-Test Scores:

Fall 1983 post-tests were used as Spring 1984 pre tests and analyzed according to the new group assignment. There were no significant differences between the two groups on the Essay Test, the Test of Standard Written English, and the Writing Apprehension Test.

There was no significant difference between the two groups on the Spelling Test.

Pre-Post Scores:

The Experimental Group (with "Proof") did not exhibit a significant change from pre to post on either the Essay Test, the Spelling Test, the Test of Standard Written English, or the Writing Apprehension Test.

The only significant pre to post change within the Experimental Group was found among males: they scored significantly higher on the Post-Essay Test than on the Pre-Essay Test. Females did not change significantly.

The Control Group (without "Proof") did not show a significant change from pre to post on the Essay Test or on the Writing Apprehension Test.

The Control Group did, however, show a significant gain from pre to post on the Spelling Testwithout access to "Proof." This group also showed a significant gain on the Test of Standard Written English.

Across Phases 1 and 2, Experimental and Control Groups, and males and females, the dimension of Mechanics is the area of greatest weakness. Composite mean scores in Phase 2, as in Phase 1, were lower than any dimension for both groups. There is a need to address this condition in future research.

Post-Test Scores:

There was no difference between the two groups on the Test of Standard English (despite the Control Group's significant gain from pre to post test), or on the Post-Essay Test. Neither was there a significant difference on the Spelling Test. Thus "Proof," which contains a spelling check, does not appear to have a positive effect on spelling improvement for a one-semester period as tested.

There was a significant difference between the groups on the Post-Writing Apprehension Test. The group without "Proof" showed lower anxiety (see Table 2, Mean Scores on Post Tests). This one-semester test suggests that "Proof" does not lower writing apprehension as assumed.

Table 2

Mean Scores on Post Tests, Phase 2

Test	Experimental Group with "Proof"	Control Group without "Proof"
ESSAY	6.6	6.7
TSWE	29.6	29.0
WAT*	77.0	88.7
SPELL	39.2	41.5

* Higher score indicates lower apprehension.

Comparison of Performance on Five Course Essays:

There was no significant difference between the two groups in the five dimensions of essay writing scored. In no dimension did the Experimental Group show better performance than the Control Group. Group mean scores in the five dimensions can be found on Table 3 below.

Table 3

Composite Mean Scores on Essay Dimensions, Phase 2

Dimension	Experimental Group with "Proof"	Control Group without "Proof"
Content	28.8	31.4
Organization	25.9	31.3
Sent. Structure	25.3	30.1
Diction	27.0	28.8
Mechanics	22.8	23.9

Repeated Measures Analysis:

On the 5 dimensions of the 5 course essays, the Experimental Group with "Proof" showed more linearity in performance pattern than the Control Group without "Proof," which showed significant curvilinearity. Again, the group with curvilinearity exhibited greater gain. These results will be discussed in the discussion section at the end of this article.

Performance Differences, Men/Women:

Replication of tests with regard to sex yielded different results than in Phase 1. In Phase 2, men writing with computers outperformed women in all five dimensions of the assigned course essays (See Table 4 below). The difference was not statistically significant, but it was consistent.

Table 4

Composite Mean Scores by Sex on Essay Dimensions, Phase 2

Dimension	Males	Females
Content	30.6	29.7
Organization	29.7	27.7
Sent. Structure	28.6	26.9
Diction	28.6	27.3
Mechanics	24.4	22.4

CONCLUSIONS

1. The addition of "Proof" to wordprocessing did not make a difference in the quality of writing in the Experimental Group, either with regard to the Post-Essay or the five required essays of the course. Given that no negative effects of "Proof" on essay writing were found, is it possible that more than a single semester is needed before positive effects of this writing aid manifest themselves? This test warrants replication.

2. Over a one-semester period, "Proof" does not lead to improved spelling, as tested. Is it possible, once again, that more than a single semester is needed before the positive effects of "Proof" on spelling manifest themselves? This test, too, deserves replication.

3. The addition of "Proof" to wordprocessing does not reduce writing apprehension in a one-semester period as tested. As in the case of essay quality, can it be that more time is needed before positive

effects in this area manifest themselves? Can it be that, contrary to our hypothesis, such matters as spelling, vocabulary, and usage account only in small measure for the anxiety many students feel about writing? Here, too, replication is warranted.

4. There was no difference between the two groups, on either pre or post test, in their ability to recognize Standard Written English.

5. As indicated by Repeated Measures tests, the intervention of "Proof" appears to generate linearity in performance pattern.

6. Unlike Phase 1, in which there was no difference between men and women using the computer for writing, tests for Phase 2 showed men outperforming women in all five areas of essay writing. Within the Experimental Group, men made more progress than women from pre to post Essay Test. Further replication is desirable.

Perhaps there is a "best-fit" set of students for writing essays on the computer. Can we go beyond the male/female distinction to profile a target population of average students who would be likely to profit most from wordprocessing?

PHASE 3, FALL 1984

OBJECTIVES

In Phase 3, answers were sought to the following questions:

1. Regarding writing quality, will a new student group using wordprocessing show a gain from pre to post essay writing scores comparable to the gain exhibited by the Experimental Group in Phase 1?

2. What is the contribution of the following characteristics to essay-writing performance among students using wordprocessing:

   a. Sex
   b. Major
   c. Prior computer experience, defined as none, slight, considerable
   d. Resident-commuter status
   e. Instructor

In other words, what could such an analysis tell us about the "best fit" between student writer and computer among the large group of students regularly assigned to "College Writing?"

3. Based on the most significant variable in the "best fit," what is the performance pattern with regard to that variable?

4. In the interest of replication: Does writing and revising on the computer increase or diminish the ability to recognize standard written English on an objective test?

5. In the interest of replication: Does wordprocessing reduce or increase writing apprehension in college freshmen?

6. In the interest of replication: Do students using "Proof" show improvement in spelling from pre to post Spelling Test?

PROCESS

In the Fall of 1984, 160 freshmen students (rather than pre-assigned classes) were randomly selected from a larger number assigned to "College Writing" on the basis of a Placement Essay Test and SAT scores. The selection process assured a representative sample. Eight classes were formed from the selection, all using XEDIT and Waterloo Script and all following the same syllabus and same writing assignments. The syllabus for "College Writing" and the course methods were the same as in Phase 1 (see p. 3). Instruction in wordprocessing was the same as in Phase 1 except that instructors were now more experienced.

In Phase 3, no control Group was formed. The eight classes were treated

as one Experimental Group. Our rationale was to replicate the tests on the Experimental Group, Phase 1, using a larger sample. We wished also to eliminate or reduce the possible Hawthorne effect which arises when an Experimental Group is matched with a Control Group. In the areas of apprehension only, comparison scores were obtained from three independent classes of "College Writing" (60 students). These classes were not following the same syllabus as the Experimental Group.

For this Experimental Group of eight classes, instructors were the same as those participating in Phases 1 and 2, with the exception of one instructor who asked to be replaced. This instructor was not comfortable with the team approach. The criteria for evaluating essay tests and course essays were the same, as was the method of scoring essays on a grading sheet.

The same pre and post Essay Test, Test of Standard Written English, and Writing Apprehension Test were administered at the beginning and end of the semester.

All eight classes had access to "Proof" so that performance in spelling could be studied further. Given the inconclusive results for spelling in Phase 2, the Roloff-Snow Spelling Test of 50 words was changed to the Sanders-Fletcher Spelling Test of 150 words (Bureau of Educational Measurements, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia Kansas). Designed for use in grades 9-12 and in college classes, this test has a reliability coefficient of .90 for the pre-testform and .91 for the post-test parallel form.

Again, students wrote 6 essays based on required essay reading. As before, these essays were scored for the dimensions of content, organization, sentence structure, diction, and mechanics.

Post-test scores and the scores for the five dimensions of student essays were analyzed (Anova) by the five independent variables listed above (see objective 2). Repeated Measures for the five dimensions of student essays were again performed.

A stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis was employed to determine the contribution of each of the same five independent variables on each criterion post score attained by the members of the study group.

RESULTS

Pre-Post Scores:

The Experimental Group (eight classes) yielded significant (Anova) gains from pre to post on the Essay Test and the Test of Standard Written English. The same group showed significant reduction in apprehension from pre to post Writing Apprehension Test. Consistency of results through replication of Phase 1 is evident.

The Experimental Group again showed a significant decline from pre to post Spelling Test. Inferences will be discussed below.

Post-Test Scores:

Regarding writing apprehension, there was a significant difference between the scores of the Experimental Group and the Independents. The Experimental Group showed higher scores, hence lower apprehension, as evidenced on Table 5. Phase 1 data which indicated reduction of apprehension in writing through computer intervention was thus supported.

Table 5

Mean Scores for Writing Apprehension

	WAT 1	WAT 2
Experimental Group (60 students)	82.19	82.89
Independents (60 students)	81.63	70.90

Analysis of Variance results of the five dimensions of Essay #6 tested along the selected independent variables (sex, major, prior computer experience, resident-commuter status, instructor) yielded no significant differences for the various dimensions with the exception of Mechanics by residence. That is, non-resident students at the College scored significantly higher in Mechanics than college residents. Given this finding, the Repeated Measures analysis was conducted using residence as the independent variable. It should be noted that differences between males and females found in Phase 2 were not verified.

Repeated Measures:

Each of the five essay dimensions were used as dependent variables and residence became the independent variable. Results were consistent. Residents displayed a flatter, more linear pattern of performance development on all five dimensions than did non-residents (commuters). Non-residents performed in a manner similar to that of the Phase 1 Experimental Group--namely, the gains in performance showed more spurts. In both cases, these were the groups whose essay scores indicated greater growth, though "significance" varied. Can we speculate that when essay writing performance development is curvilinear it is enhanced?

Regression Analysis:

Though minimal significance was found as a result of the Analyses of Variance, the contribution of each of the selected independent variables to the various aspects measured was needed to profile a "best fit."

On the Post-Test of Standard Written English, on which the Experimental Group exhibited a significant gain, residence accounted for 58% of the. variance, computer experience for 6%, and the instructor for 1%. Sex and major contributed nothing to the variance.

On the Post-Essay Test, on which the Experimental Group again exhibited a significant gain, residence accounted for 4% of the variance, major 1%, the instructor 1%, with sex and computer experience making no contribution. (Those with liberal arts majors tended to score higher than their counterparts.)

On the Post-Spelling Test, residence accounted for 4% of the variance and major 1%, with computer experience, sex, and instructor making no contribution.

On the Post-Writing Apprehension Test, where a significant gain had been made from pre to post test, the student's major accounted for 4% of the variance, instructor 1%, and sex 1%, with residence and computer experience making no contribution

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS FOR PHASES 1-3

The following earlier conclusions were supported through replication:

1. Computer intervention in Phases 1 and 3 significantly enhanced the writing of essays as measured. In Phase 2, scores indicated growth, though not significantly.

2. Tests in Phases 2 and 3 indicated that computer intervention in the form a spelling check may inhibit spelling performance.

3. Computer intervention yielded mixed results with regard to the Test of Standard Written English. In Phase 1, no significant gain was found. In Phase 2, only the group without "Proof" showed significant gain. In Phase 3, the entire group showed significant gain. In no case did computer intervention reduce the recognition of Standard Written English. Replication is obviously needed.

4. Computer intervention in Phases 1 and 3 impacted on the pattern of performance.

5. Computer intervention tended to reduce writing apprehension. Phase 1 showed a positive direction but without statistical significance;

Phase 2 showed no significant change; Phase 3 showed a significant reduction in apprehension.

The following tentative conclusions emerge from Regression Analysis:

1. The results of the Analysis of Variance were supported by the Regression Analysis; residence appears to be the greatest and perhaps only variable defined toward a "best fit." Other potential variables need to be defined and tested.

2. None of the four other variables tested appears significant in final performance.

3. That the variable of instructor made so small a contribution to performance indicates that instruction had been standardized to a high degree across the eight sections of College Writing.

Regression model results were inconclusive for this one-semester test. Conclusions needed verification.

PHASE 4, SPRING 1985

OBJECTIVES

The questions posed in Phase 3 (see p. 21), except for the one concerned with spelling, were once again addressed in Phase 4. Spelling was no longer tested since evidence in that area appeared conclusive.

PROCESS

Mainly because of course conflicts, five students moved out of the Experimental Group for the second-semester course "Rhetoric." The Experimental Group now consisted of 155 students almost equally divided between males and females. Fall semester post scores (Essay Test, Test of Standard Written English, Writing Apprehension Test) again became Spring semester pre scores. Once again, three independent classes of "Rhetoric" served as a control group for Writing Apprehension. These classes were not receiving identical instruction and assignments. Analysis of Variance, Repeated Measures, and Multiple Regression were once again employed to replicate the tests of Phase 3.

RESULTS

Pre-Post Scores:

The Experimental Group, writing and revising essays on the computer, made significant gains pre to post on the Essay Test, as well as on the Test of Standard Written English (TSWE). The Experimental Group also exhibited reduction of apprehension as measured by the Writing Apprehension Test (WAT).

We recall that in previous tests the two demographic variables that yielded differences were sex and residence. Mean scores for each of these sub-groups can be found on Table 6.

Table 6

Sub-Group Mean Scores on Spring 1985 Pre-Post Tests

Test	Males	Females	Residents	Commuters
Pre-Essay Test	6.2	6.6	5.3	7.2
Post-Essay Test	6.5	7.0	6.6	8.1
Pre-TSWE	26.4	28.2	26.7	27.2
Post-TSWE	30.9	31.8	29.6	36.7

Pre-WAT	88.5	85.7	83.0	86.1
Post-WAT	89.7	88.0	89.0	85.5

The scores listed above indicate that though the Experimental Group made a significant gain from pre to post tests, the sub-group essentially responsible for this gain was the commuter student.

No significant differences were found on composite essay scores by dimension within the Experimental Group on the basis of the five independent variables: sex, residence, computer experience, instructor, and major--with one exception. Non-resident students scored significantly higher on the dimension of mechanics than did resident students. It should be remembered that in Phase 1 mechanics proved to be the problem dimension for the Experimental Group.

Post-Test Scores:

There was no statistically significant difference between the Experimental group and the selected independent classes with regard to apprehension, though the independent group yielded actual scores indicating less apprehension

Regression Analysis:

Residence again generated the greatest contribution to the variance on both the Essay Test and the Test of Standard Written English. Replication thus supported earlier findings. Once again, variance contribution by the remaining variables was minimal.

Repeated Measures:

Given the results of the Regression Analysis, residence was once again employed as the independent variable. The results of the Phase 3 Repeated Measures Test were verified through replication. Along all five dimensions of essay scores, non-residents displayed spurts (curvilinearity) whereas residents exhibited a linear performance pattern.

Composite scores on all five essays for sub-groups based on sex and residence along the five essay score dimensions can be found on Table 7.

Table 7

Sub-group Composite Scores on Spring 1985 Essay Dimensions

Essay Dimension	Males	Females	Residents	Commuters
Content	17.7	18.2	15.3	26.2
Sent.Structure	17.5	18.4	15.4	26.4
Organization	18.3	19.0	15.1	28.6
Diction	17.8	18.2	15.2	27.1
Mechanics	15.5	17.0	13.8	26.1

It should be noted that the Phase 2 indication of weaker performance of females using the computer was not verified through replication.

CONCLUSIONS

In the Spring of 1985, pre-to-post-score gains for students using wordprocessing were positive: significant positive changes were made on the Essay Test, the Test of Standard Written English, and the Writing Apprehension Test.

Results of both Regression and Repeated Measures Tests were confirmed through replication. Residence is a major contributor to performance in essay writing. The commuter student exhibits superior performance.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR THE TWO-YEAR PERIOD

At the outset, we listed five questions (pp. 3-4) for which answers were sought over a two-year period. Below, we offer the answers to those questions generated by ourstudy.

1. Computer intervention in 3 out of 4 findings (Phases 1, 3, 4) enhanced the writing of essays as measured. In no instance, did the use of the computer worsen writing. As we concluded in Phases 2 and 3, computer intervention in the form of a spelling check may inhibit spelling performance.

2. Computer intervention in 3 out of 4 findings (Phases 2, 3, 4) increased scores on the Test of Standard Written English. Students showed an increased ability to recognize Standard Written English on an objective test. In no instance, did the use of the computer diminish this ability.

3. Repeated Measures Analysis indicates that computer intervention can

impact on the pattern of essay-writing performance, altering it from linear to curvilinear--that is, showing more spurts of progress. A positive correlation was noted, for all groups tested, between higher essay scores and greater curvilinearity in performance pattern.

4. Computer intervention in 3 out of 4 findings (Phases 1, 3, 4) reduced writing apprehension as measured. In no instance did the use of the computer increase writing apprehension. As concluded in Phases 2 and 3, computer intervention in the form of a spelling check, thesaurus, and style check ("Proof") does not appear to reduce writing apprehension. Perhaps replication with another software check is appropriate.

5. Regression Analysis, initially and in replication, indicated that of the sub-groups studied, non-resident students (commuters) performed best using wordprocessing.

DISCUSSION

Students using the computer showed enhanced writing despite the fact that they lost three hours of class instruction time in order to learn wordprocessing and had the additional requirement of mastering the rudiments of a new skill. Even for quick learners, wordprocessing can be disorienting and frustrating at the outset and, for some, a distraction from the writing process.

What accounts for the enhanced writing of students using wordprocessing? Is it the novelty of using a new writing tool? Is it the sense of being an elite group at the forefront of an electronic revolution? These factors may help in part to explain the positive performance. Did they revise more? It is not clear whether freshmen using the computer did more revision, or more effective revision, than those who did not use the computer, because the nature of student revision was not examined in detail in this study. It can be conjectured, however, that relieved of the drudgery of having to retype drafts as they made changes in a text, students could spend more time on the content of their papers. They could focus more fully on the substance of their writing rather than on the pedestrian task of making the copy look good. Because the final copy looked good--more professional in appearance than the student could normally create on the typewriter--could it be that the student was motivated to take greater pains with his writing to avoid a disparity between appearance and substance?

What appears clear enough, from evidence described below, is that students using the computer came to their writing with less resistance, with a greater willingness to write, to revise, and to refine their work than formerly. For most students, the computer placed writing in a new, fresh, more pleasurable context--a context divorced from past associations of frustration and tedium. Essay writing improved, it can be conjectured, because students enjoyed writing more. They were not fighting the writing process as much as before.

Student responses in the Fall of 1984 (Phase 3) to a brief questionnaire (see Appendix H) conveyed how students felt about using the computer for writing essays. Of the 156 freshmen who completed the questionnaire (four were absent on the day it was distributed), 87% indicated Yes to the question: "Are you glad that you were assigned to a computer section of 'College Writing'?" 2% indicated that they were not glad to have been so assigned, and 10% indicated that they were not sure how they felt on this matter.

Asked whether they had used the computer to write essays for courses other than "College Writing," 62% indicated that they had done so, and 26% indicated that they had written papers for two or more courses other than "College Writing." Asked whether they had demonstrated wordprocessing to friends and relatives, 67% indicated that they had done so.

Asked whether they thought all freshmen should learn wordprocessing as part of the "College Writing" course, 87% answered affirmatively; the rest were unsure. Asked whether they were pleased to have continued access to the computer for the follow-up course in freshman writing ("Rhetoric"), 97% answered affirmatively. It is worth noting that whereas 13% had reservations about being assigned to a computer section of "College Writing," only 3% had reservations about continuing into a computer section of "Rhetoric."

These statistics are offered to underscore the point made above. For the most part, students enjoyed writing with the computer. That enjoyment may be seen as a major factor accounting for the gains made in writing.

The questionnaire also solicited comments about the experience of using the computer for writing. Satisfaction is a recurring theme in student responses: "I cannot say whether the computer has helped my writing, but it has made both the course and the writing assignments more enjoyable." Another students wrote: "The use of the computer makes the course more interesting." And another: "I feel that my writing may improve because I really enjoy using the computer."

Of course, not every student had such enthusiastic things to say about the computer for writing. A number were emphatic about the frustrations of learning wordprocessing, or the inconvenience of equipment breakdown. "When I try to type a paper into the computer," writes one student, "I get so wrapped up in the mechanics that I pay less attention to my writing. I find that the best way for me to write a paper is to do it by hand, then type it into the machine." And another student writes: "I was working on one of my projects when all of a sudden the system went down. I couldn't even log off or file. When I returned later, I found I had lost the file I was working on. I was so mad I felt like breaking the machine." Still, the proportion of positive statements--those stressing satisfaction--was far greater than the proportion of negative ones, the ratio being approximately 10 to 1.

The enjoyment of using the computer may also help to explain the reduced writing apprehension. A writing process that is less onerous, more satisfying, opens up the possibility of a relationship with language that is less anxiety producing. Just as the handsome, clean printout may have a bearing on the quality of the writing, so too it may impact on apprehension. Students often worry about their hard-to-read, often-criticized handwriting, or they worry about their poor typing, but now the electronic printer eliminates that apprehension. They no longer have to be so concerned about the appearance of the paper, a concern that for many students goes back to their early days at school.

Without being asked to comment on the subject of apprehension, one student had this to say: "The computer turned writing into a less traumatic experience for me." And another wrote: "I must say that my overall attitude toward writing has improved. I look forward to, or at least don't dread, writing essays." It is still a minority of students who are actually expressing such sentiments, but comments like these are nevertheless encouraging. If as a result of the computer, writing becomes a less feared activity for students of average ability, various possibilities open up. Students may do more independent writing--that is, writing apart from course assignments. They may be more inclined to elect, rather than shy away from, courses that may require a significant amount of writing. They may elect writing courses more readily than they do now. They may be more inclined to consider careers that call for writing instead of avoiding such careers. But most important, they are likely to improve their writing. As John A. Daly states (1985):

> An individual's attitude about writing is just as basic to successful writing as his or her writing skills. For no matter how skillful the individual is as a writer, without a willingness to engage in writing, one can expect little more than the atrophying of composing skills. A positive attitude about writing is associated with, and may even be a critical precursor of, the successful development and maintenance of writing skills.

Surprisingly, the spelling check, thesaurus, and style check ("Proof") did not result in reduced apprehension among its users as assumed. Is it possible that, for whatever reasons, students did not consistently avail themselves of this aid? Was the invocation of "Proof" while revising an essay an unwelcome complexity for students learning and adjusting to wordprocessing? We believe this test deserves replication.

In our summary of results, we noted that wordprocessing fostered among freshmen writers a greater ability to recognize Standard Written English on an objective test. How do we explain this? All essay writing in our program required the reading of contemporary essays. With less time required to retype their essays, students may have spent a greater amount of time reading in preparation for writing. If we are correct in this speculation, such greater attention to reading may have been a factor in the improved ability to recognize Standard Written English. A further speculation: while in the process of writing on the computer, students may be reading and examining text on a screen more than they are writing and rewriting. This greater attention to reading, both in a book and on the screen, may have fostered greater sensitivity to the

idiom and rhythms of Standard Written English.

How do we account for the fact that using the computer results in a curvilinear rather than a linear performance pattern in essay writing among the groups that outperformed their counterparts? How can instructors in writing use this information in their teaching? These and other questions remain to be answered.

Non-resident students in the Experimental Group complained the most about using computers for writing. Not having as much time to spend on campus as do resident students, they resented being confined to the writing lab for the writing and printing of their essays. One student wrote: "It's darn inconvenient for me to have to do my writing in one place only, the computer lab. I'm a commuter, and I can't always come back to campus in the evening or on Saturdays to work on my essays." Commuters also saw themselves as having less time than residents to practice wordprocessing to acquire the skill. Ironically, it was the commuters who performed better than any other sub-group among our computer users. Having less time to work on the terminals, perhaps they put that time to fullest use? Not distracted as much as residents students by campus activities, perhaps they spent more time thinking about and planning their essays? (It would be interesting to learn whether non-resident students outperform residents in most classes.)

Though the spelling check did not contribute to improved spelling among our freshmen, we plan, for a number of reasons to continue using it. To begin with, the spelling check will soon be as ubiquitous as the pocket calculator. If we remove it from the computer lab, the student will have it on his/her home computer. Furthermore, he or she will most likely find it and use it in the world of work. What is important is that the spelling check not weaken spelling ability. Teachers should alert students to that possible danger. More important, teachers should devise classroom strategies to encourage and challenge students to keep records of misspelled words. They should encourage students to reduce their dependence on the check from essay to essay. In short, they should help make the spelling check a learning aid in the college classroom.

To dispense with the spelling check in the college environment is to remove some of its real advantages. The spelling check alerts the writer to spelling errors and typos he or she would not himself recognize. Even where the writer suspects a word to be misspelled, he or she is often reluctant to take the time to consult a dictionary or too embarrassed to ask a fellow writer for assistance. The spelling check is of value in flagging such words not acted upon. It is of value, furthermore, in allowing the student to present to the instructor a paper that does not by its spelling errors distract the reader away from the substance of the essay. Students with ideas deserve to be read without the bias that spelling errors can call forth in most readers. One day an electronic spelling check will be devised that will more actively contribute to the improvement of spelling. Such checks may have to be less generous to students than present ones which promptly offer the correct spelling at no expense of effort from the user.

QUESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

1. Will students who were exposed to wordprocessing during the period Fall 1983 to Spring 1985 write better essays in non-English courses than their conventional counterparts? Will these students show a stronger academic record after four years than their counterparts who used conventional writing tools during the four-year period?

2. It has been observed that most student revision even after two semesters is "cosmetic"--that is, affecting words and phrases mainly. Will students using the computer over a longer period than two semesters do more in-depth revision of their essays? Will they go more fully beyond the word and sentence level to matters of content and organization?

3. Will students who were exposed to wordprocessing elect more writing courses during the four-year period than their fellow students who wrote with conventional writing tools?

4. Will students who were exposed to wordprocessing be more inclined than their fellow students who wrote with conventional tools to select careers that involve writing?

The questions cited above all point to the value of a follow-up stud which would track the subjects of our two-year study until they graduate.

A number of additional research questions emerge from the foregoing study:

1. If wordprocessing can improve the writing of students of average writing ability (the students dealt within this study), can it help students of superior writing ability? Of inferior writing ability? Which ability group does wordprocessing help the most?

2. Are there students who ought not to be using wordprocessing as part of their writing instruction? How are they to be identified?

3. Will students who use wordprocessing write more quantity of text--that is, more fully developed essays (without redundancy and irrelevance) than students who write with conventional tools?

4. Would wordprocessing on the personal computer yield results different from the results obtained on terminals linked to a mainframe.

5. Would the use of an editor other than XEDIT--one that is easier to learn and to use-- produce results different from that obtained in this study?

5. Would reading from displays with first-rate fonts produce results different from that obtained in this study?

6. Would the availability of letter-quality printers (rather than matrix printers) produce results different from that obtained in this study?

7. Freshman writers know little about the process of revision. Will more intensive instruction in how to revise an essay lead to more favorable performance among students using wordprocessing?

8. Will students who use wordprocessing show better class attendance than those who do not? Will they show less tardiness in submitting papers, as well as less assignment delinquency? Will they bring more carefully prepared preliminary drafts to conference sessions?

The questions originally posed for this two-year study have been answered with the kind of empirical evidence appropriate for the growing and important field of computers and the teaching of writing. Some, if not all, of our tests can benefit from replication--in particular, our Fall 1983 test (Phase 1) which balanced an Experimental Group using computers with a Control Group using traditional writing tools.

Most respectable studies generate more research questions than they answer. As the above list indicates, this study has been no exception. We have learned that the essay writing of freshmen of average writing ability is modestly enhanced over a one-year span and that their apprehension about writing is modestly reduced. If we had to select the main questions that insinuate themselves for future research they are these: (a) Will the students of average ability in our Experimental groups show a better record in essay writing over the long span (the four-year college period) than their counterparts who use pens and typewriters? (b) What are the effects of the computer on essay quality and writing apprehension among college freshmen of both strong and weak writing ability? (c) Will the personal computer yield results in the area of writing quality and apprehension different from that obtained from the terminal linked to a large computer?

The study of computers and writing is still in its infancy. There is much that remains to be learned.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was made possible through generous support from Marist College and through a Study Contract from the IBM Corporation. The authors wish to acknowledge the outstanding teaching and research contributions of the following colleagues: Professors Joseph Belanger, Sydna Byrne, Janice Casey, Donna Croshier, John Hunter, Robert Lewis, and Marian McGillicutty. Special thanks are due to Dr. Lance A. Miller of the Thomas J. Watson Research Center for valuable suggestions relating to research design.

REFERENCES

Bean, J.C. Computerized word-processing as aid to revision. College Composition and Communication, 1983, 34, 146-148.

Bridwell, L.S, Nancarrow, P.R. & Ross, D. The writing process and the writing machine: Current research on word processors relevant to the teaching of composition. In Richard Beach and Lillian S. Bridwell (Eds.), New Directions in Composition Research. New York: The Guilford Press, 1984, pp. 381-398.

Daiute, C.A The computer as stylus and audience. College Composition and Communication, 1983, 34, 134-145.

Daly, J.A. Writing apprehension. In M. Rose (Ed.), Writing Blocks. New York: The Guilford Press, 1985.

Daly, J.A. & Miller, M.D. The empirical development of an instrument to measure writing apprehension. Research in the Teaching of English, 1975, 9, 242-249.

Daly, J.A. & Miller, M.D. Further studies in writing apprehension: SAT scores, success expectations, willingness to take advanced courses, and sex differences. Research in the Teaching of English, 1975, 9, 250-256.

Daly, J.A. & Shamo, W. Writing apprehension and occupational choice. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 1976, 49, 55-56.

Daly, J.A. & Shamo, W. Academic decisions as a function of writing apprehension. Research in the Teaching of English, 1978, 12, 119-126.

Feldman, P.R. Personal computers in a writing class. Perspectives in Computing, 1984, 4, 2-8.

Geist, R. & Geist, H. A word to the wise. PC Products, November 1985, 69-82.

Harris, Jeanette. Student writers and word processing: a preliminary evaluation. College Composition and Communication, 1985, 36, 323.

Pufahl, J. Response to Richard M. Collier, 'The Word Processor and Revision Strategies.' College Composition and Communication, 1984, 35,

91.

Richmond, V.P. & Dickson, F. Two studies of the validity of the writing apprehension test. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Eastern Communication Association, Ocean City, Md., April, 1980.

Roloff, J.G. & Snow, R. Spelling. Encino, California: Glencoe Publishing Co., 1980, pp. 249-250; 282-283.

Schwartz, M. Computers and the teaching of writing. Educational Technology, 1982, 22, 27-29.

Selfe, C.L. The composing processes of four high and four low writing apprehensives: A modified case study. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas, Austin, 1981

APPENDIX A

SYLLABUS FOR COLLEGE WRITING, CORE 106

College Writing is a foundation course for all courses you will take at Marist. What you learn about writing, and the skills and habits you develop in this course, will have a direct bearing on your academic success during the next four years.

This course assumes your commitment to improving your writing. Given that commitment, you can expect this course to be a deeply rewarding experience.

What follows gives you essential, preliminary information for your productive participation in this course. Please read this material carefully.

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS FOR CORE 106, COLLEGE WRITING:

1. Writing is best learned by writing.
2. Writing is rewriting: revision is essential to effective writing.
3. Talking about writing is not as productive as writing and rewriting.
4. Extensive and attentive reading supports good writing.
5. The content of the course is essentially what the student writes.
6. Students can be encouraged to learn by themselves and to exploit available resources (Learning Center, Library, Computer Center).
7. Word-processing and text-critiquing systems open up the possibility of improved student writing by encouraging revision and independent learning. (Applicable to sections using computers.)
8. The individual conference is one of the most valuable forms of writing instruction.

IMMEDIATE AIMS OF CORE 106:

To guide the student in the writing of essays which show:

1. a clear sense of purpose
2. coherence
3. a sense of audience
4. fullness of development
5. attention to the conventions of spelling, punctuation, grammar, and usage.

ULTIMATE AIMS OF CORE 106:

1. to give the student a sense of the value of written expression as part of the thinking and learning process.
2. to give the student a greater sense of confidence in his writing ability.
3. to broaden the student's understanding of the writing process.
4. to give the student a sense of the computer as a powerful tool for writing which he can make use of during his four years at college and beyond. (Applicable to sections using computers.)

REQUIREMENTS FOR CORE 106:

1. Regular writing, both out of class and in class.
   A piece of written discourse, either a new composition or a revision, will be expected every week.
   Other exercises will be assigned as needed.
   A total of six (6) essays (500-750 words) will be required during the semester.
   The student will submit only typed manuscripts.

   In sections using computers, students will be required to learn word-processing.
   Students will write all essays, including drafts, on the computer.
   Handwritten or typed manuscripts will not be accepted.

2. Readings from a collection of essays on contemporary subjects and issues.
   These essays will serve as models for discussion, examination, and the stimulation of student writing.

3. A mid-term and a final essay examination.
   These exams will test the student's ability to compose an essay having the qualities described above under "Immediate Aims."
   The final exam will be graded by the class instructor as well as by two members of the Marist Writing Faculty.

4. Small-group activities.
   Teachers will ask students to write in class, to share their writing with others in groups, to collaborate in revision exercises or in the editing of each other's manuscripts.
   Students are expected to participate in such activities, and teachers will assign a portion of the grade to their participation.

5. NOTE ON ATTENDANCE:

   Students are required to attend all classes, including scheduled conferences with instructor.
   Students are also required to attend the special lecture

in the theater.
A student who misses a class is expected to give the instructor an acceptable written explanation on his or her return to class. Unexcused absences will result in a lowered grade.

GRADING:

A student's final grade will be based on his six essays and the mid-term exam (70%); on attendance and small-group participation (15%); and on the final essay examination (15%).

TEXTS:

1. Behrens, Laurence, and Rosen Leonard, editors. WRITING AND READING ACROSS THE CURRICULUM. Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1982.

2. Corbett, John. THE LITTLE ENGLISH HANDBOOK. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1978.

MATERIALS:

To be brought to each class or conference:

1. Texts
2. A writing folder
3. Handouts
4. Pen and paper

ADDITIONAL NOTES:

1. Except for emergencies, no papers will be accepted late.

2. Students are required to make duplicate copies of the preliminary and final draft of each writing project.

3. Students are required to include a letter of submission with each writing project.

4. All papers should be stapled once in the upper left corner.

THE WRITING FACULTY EXTENDS BEST WISHES TO YOU FOR A PROFITABLE AND SATISFYING SEMESTER.

Essay Assignments For College Writing, Core 106

Students will devote two weeks to each of the following essay assignments. A preliminary draft of the essay is due at the end of the first week; the final version is due at the end of the second week. All work submitted must be carefully proofread.

Unless otherwise indicated, readings appear in WRITING AND READING ACROSS THE CURRICULUM, edited by Laurence Pehrens and Leonard Rosen, Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1982.

1. Read Section 8, "Death and Dying", pp. 286-339.

You have just learned that you have only six months to live but that you will not be severely incapacitated until the end of this period. Drawing upon the readings in this section, write a letter to a close friend telling, as specifically as you can, how you plan to spend these last months of your life.

2. Read Section 12, "Personality," pp. 511-547.

Drawing upon the readings in this section, write a detailed description of your own personality or the personality of someone you know very well. Your essay will be a synthesis of your own ideas and ideas presented in the readings.

3. Read Section 5, "A Closer Look at Fairy Tales," pp. 163-203.

Frame and support a thesis based on the question: Are fairy tales suitable for children? You are expected to draw upon the readings in Section 5.

4. Read Section 6, "Obedience to Authority," pp. 205-250.

Write a critique of the Milgram Experiment, noting its strengths and weaknesses. You are expected to draw upon the three selections in the text dealing with the experiment, as well as upon other readings in Section 6 that are relevant.

5. Read Section 10, "Politics and Language," pp. 412-460.

Drawing upon the readings in this section, write an essay in which you (1) establish your criteria for good political speech-writing and (2) evaluate the inaugural address of either Franklin D. Roosevelt, John F. Kennedy, or Ronald Reagan by the criteria you have established.

6. Read Section 7, "The Age of Computers and Beyond," pp. 251-282.

Drawing upon the readings in this section and upon your own experience using the computer, discuss what you perceive to be the powers and the limitations of the computer.

APPENDIX B

Writing Placement/Proficiency Examination - June 1983

INSTRUCTIONS: Use as much paper as you need for notes, outlining, etc., but submit final copy only. In the upper right corner of the first sheet of your final copy, put your name, today's date, and whether you are entering Marist as a freshman or a transfer. Repeat your name on each sheet after the first.

TOPIC: The following article expresses its author's experience with, and opinion of, television programing. Your assignment is to write an essay in which, basing what you say on your own experience with TV, you react to the article.

CAUTION: You are not asked merely to summarize or rephrase the article in your own words, nor to analyze it in detail. You are asked to compose an essay in which you integrate a few references to the article (showing that you have read and carefully considered it) with a clear presentation of your own opinion of the medium.

REMEMBER: The readers of your paper are not at all concerned with whether you like or dislike TV. They are concerned with the effectiveness of your exposition of your own opinion.

OUSTING THE STRANGER
FROM THE HOUSE
by Colman McCarthy

When I turned off the television for the last time about a year ago and dumped the set for good, some friends, relatives and unasked advisers on the block predicted I would not last long without it. Few disputed the common gripe that TV is a wasteland, with irrigation offered only by the rare trickle of a quality program. Instead, they doubted that the addiction of some twenty years before the tube could be stilled by this sudden break with the past. It is true that an addiction had me, my veins eased only by a fix of 30 to 35 hours a week; my wife's dosage was similar, and our children -- three boys under 7 -- already listened more to the television than to us.

Now, a year later -- a family living as cultural cave men, says an anthropologist friend -- the decision we made was one of the wisest of our married life. The ratings -- our private Nielsens -- during this year of setlessness have been high, suggesting that such common acts as talking with one's children, sharing ideas with one's wife, walking to the neighborhood library on a Saturday morning, quiet evenings of reading books and magazines aloud to each other, or eating supper as a family offer more intellectual and emotional stimulation than anything on television.

The severity of an addiction to TV is not that it reduces the victim to passivity while watching it but that it demands he be a compulsive activist to get in front of it. If I arrived home at 6, for example, and dinner was ready at 6:25--my wife's afternoon had run late, so dinner was late--I would shove down the food in five minutes. The deadline, falling like a guillotine, was at 6:30. Chancellor came on then, Cronkite at 7; if CBS was dull, Smith and Reasoner were on ABC. If I hadn't finished dinner, I would sprint back to the table during the commercials for short-order gulps, then back to cool John, Uncle Walter or wry Harry. My wife, desperate Mav, was left at the table to control the bedlam of the kids, caused by my in-and-out sprints. The chaos I heard coming from the dining room was fitting: it was matched by the chaos in the world reported on the evening news, except the latter, in the vague "out there," was easier to handle.

With the set gone, these compulsions and in-turnings have gone too. We eat dinner in leisure and peace now. We stay at the playground until the children have had enough fun, not when I need to rush home to watch

the 4 P.M. golf. Occasionally, my wife and I have the exotic experience of spending an evening in relaxed conversation, not the little half-stops of talk we once made in a force march to Marital Communication. In those days, we would turn off the set in midevening and be immediately oppressed by the silence.

What had been happening all those years of watching television, I see now, was not only an addiction but also, on a deeper level, an adjustment. All of us had become adjusted to living with a stranger in the house. Is there any more basic definintion of a television set than that? More, the stranger in the house was not there to entertain us, a notion the televisers would like to serve. The stranger was present to sell us products. The person before a set may think he is a viewer but the sponsors who pay for broadcasts know better: he is a buyer. It is a commercial arrangement, with the TV set a salesman permanently assigned to one house, and often two or three salesmen working different rooms. It is a myth that TV is free entertainment.

I was not only paying personally for the stranger-salesman in my house but he was often manipulating or lying to my children. I saw the effects in such places as the supermarket aisles, when the boys would loudly demand a sugared cereal, junk-snack or six pack of soda, all of these items only high-priced garbage that helps rot the teeth and keeps children from fruit and other nutritious food. My kids had been conditioned well by the sellers on TV, predatory strangers as menacing in one way as street predators are in another. But, someone told me, that's only commercial television, suggesting that programs like "Sesame Street" and its mimics are different. They are, perhaps, but no more worthy.

If the televisers want to teach my children something, I suggest such subjects as obedience to parents, sharing toys with brothers and sisters, kindness to animals, respect for grandparents. These kinds of lessons were strangely missing from the "quality" childrens' shows I looked in on. It is true that these concepts must be taught by the parents but it is insufferable to note the preachings of the "Sesame"-type producers, hearing them blat about how they care for children. I see their programs as a moral hustle, conning parents into thinking it's a high educational experience to dump the kids before the tube. In the end, the hammering about letters, shapes, numbers does not liberate the child's imagination. It captures it, a quick-action lariat that ropes in the child's most precious resource, his creativity.

Occasionally I have feelings that I may be missing an event of special value, a feeling that the televised truth goes marching on without me. But in my straggler status I have never failed to catch up eventually with the essence of what I missed, mostly by reading the newspapers or magazines--say a Presidential press conference or the Watergate testimony.*

The stranger is gone now. Our lives are fuller and richer. Cold turkey worked. The kids don't run to neighbors' houses to watch TV, as I had feared. As for whether we ever invite the stranger back to our house, it isn't likely unless the industry learns new manners.

A first sign of the kind of manners I'm thinking about would be revealed if, say, some evening this announcement was beamed into the 97 per cent of America's electrically wired homes that have TV's: "Ladies and gentlemen, until further notice we are ceasing our broadcasts. The programs we had planned are now seen to be dull, banal (insipid), pointless not worth your time and not ours. Don't turn to another channel, because you will only be insulted there too--insulted by the programs and by the corporate advertisers who want to gull you into buying products you can live well, even better, without.

"Come forward and turn off your set. When the die-out appears, get up and take a walk to the library and get a book. Or turn to your husband and wife and surprise them with a conversation. Or call a neighbor you haven't spoken with in months. Write a letter to a friend who had lost track of you. Turn off your set now. When we devise some worthwhile programming, we'll be back on the air. Meanwhile, you'll be missing almost nothing."

*Widely reported investigation into alleged wrong-doing in the Nixon administration (1972-1974).

Core 107/Proficiency December 1983

Final Examination: Rhetoric of Exposition/Writing Proficiency

INSTRUCTIONS: Use as much paper as you need for notes, outlining, etc., but submit the final copy only. In the upper right corner of the first sheet of your final copy, put your name, today's date. Repeat your name on each sheet after the first.

TOPIC: The following article expresses its author's views of the current emphasis on self-awareness and self-expression, the "new narcissism." Drawing upon your experiences at Marist and elsewhere, and upon your own ideas, compose an essay in which you respond to the attitudes and opinions expressed in the article.

CAUTION: You are not asked merely to summarize or rephrase the article in your own words, nor to analyze it in detail. You are asked to compose an essay in which you integrate references to the article (showing that you have read and carefully considered it) with a clear presentation of your own opinion of the subject.

REMEMBER: The readers of your paper are not at all concerned with whether you agree or disagree with the author. They are concerned with the effectiveness of your exposition of your own position.

AS:jk

What's Wrong With Me?
by Margaret Halsey

Tom Wolfe has christened today's young adults the "me" generation and the 1970s--obsessed with things like consciousness expansion and self-awareness-have been described as the decade of the new narcissism. The cult of "I", in fact, has taken hold with the strength and impetus of a new religion. But the joker in the pact is that it is all based on a false idea.

The false idea is that inside every human being, however unprepossessing, there is a glorious, talented and overwhelmingly attractive personality. This personality--so runs the erroneous belief--will be revealed in all its splendor if the individual just forgets about courtesy, cooperativeness and consideration for others and proceeds to do exactly what he or she feels like doing.

Nonsense.

Inside each of us is a mess of unruly primitive impulses, and these can sometimes, under the strenuous self-discipline and dedication of art, result in notable creativity. But there is no such thing as a pure, crystalline and well-organized "native" personality, though a host of trendy human-potential industry is the advertising profession, which also encourages the idea of an Inner Wonderfulness that will be unveiled to a suddenly respectful world upon the purchase of this or that commodity.

"I don't know who I am." How many bartenders and psychiatrists have stifled yawns on hearing that popular threnody for the thousandth time!

But this sentence has no meaning unless spoken by an amnesia victim, because many of the people who say they do not know who they are, actually do know. What such people really mean is that they are not satisfied with who they are. They feel themselves to be timid and colorless or to be in some way or other fault-ridden, but they have soaked up enough advertising and enough catch-penny ideas of self-improvement to believe in universal Inner Wonderfulness. So they turn their backs on their honest knowledge of themselves--which with patience and courage could start them on the road to genuine development--and embark on a quest for a will-o-the-wisp called "identity".

The idea of a universal Inner Wonderfulness that

will be apparent to all beholders after a six-week course in self-expression is fantasy.

But how did this fantasy gain wide popular acceptance as a realizable fact?

Every society tries to produce a prevalent psychological type that will best serve its ends, and that type is always prone to certain emotional malfunctions. In early capitalism, which was a producing society, the ideal type was acquisitive, fanatically devoted to hard work and fiercely repressive of sex. The emotional malfunctions to which this type was liable were hysteria and obsession. Later capitalism, today's capitalism, is a consuming society, and the psychological type it strives to create, in order to build up the largest possible markets, is shallow easily swayed and characterized much more by self-infatuation than self-respect. The emotional malfunction of this type is narcissism.

A long time ago, in a book called "Civilization and Its Discontents," Freud pointed out that there is an unresolvable conflict between the human being's selfish primitive, infantile impulses and the restraint he or she must impose on those impulses if a stable society is to be maintained. The "self" is not a handsome god or goddess waiting coyly to be revealed. On the contrary, its complexity, confusion and mystery have proved so difficult that throughout the ages men and women have talked gratefully about losing themselves. They lose the self in contemplating a great work of art, or in nature, or in scientific research, or in writing poetry, or in fashioning things with their hands or in projects that will benefit others rather than themselves.

The current glorification of self-love will turn out in the end to be a no-win proposition, because in questions of personality or "identity," what counts is not who you are, but what you do. "By their fruits, he shall know them." And by their fruits, they shall know themselves.

Time—30 minutes
50 QUESTIONS

Directions: The following sentences contain problems in grammar, usage, diction (choice of words), and idiom.

Some sentences are correct.
No sentence contains more than one error.

You will find that the error, if there is one, is underlined and lettered. Assume that all other elements of the sentence are correct and cannot be changed. In choosing answers, follow the requirements of standard written English.

If there is an error, select the one underlined part that must be changed to make the sentence correct, and blacken the corresponding space on your answer sheet.

If there is no error, blacken answer space Ⓔ.

EXAMPLE:

He spoke bluntly (A) and angrily (B) to we (C) spectators (D). No error (E)

SAMPLE ANSWER

Ⓐ Ⓑ ● Ⓓ Ⓔ

1. At the top of the mountain there is (A) several (B) ski runs that only (C) the most adventurous (D) skiers explore. No error (E)

2. Because (A) neither my sister nor me (B) remembered to turn (C) the clock ahead, we both were late for (D) school. No error (E)

3. Even though the colonists had demanded their (A) own freedom, slavery is (B) still (C) legal in all thirteen (D) colonies when the Declaration of Independence was signed. No error (E)

4. Solar energy research has brung (A) hope that the United States will be able to lessen (B) its dependence on (C) oil in (D) the foreseeable future. No error (E)

5. Political opponents cannot be expected (A) to produce (B) a simple solution to (C) so complex of a (D) problem. No error (E)

6. According to some journalists, baseball, of all (A) the professional team sports, have inspired (B) the most memorable (C) sports writing published in (D) this century. No error (E)

7. My great-grandmother, who was visiting (A) friends in Philadelphia when (B) the Civil War started, was unable to (C) return home (D) for months. No error (E)

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

APPENDIX D

NAME_____ DATE_____

COURSE_____ SECTION_____

Directions: Below is a series of statements about writing. There are no right or wrong answers. Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you. Do this by indicating whether you

(1) strongly agree
(2) agree
(3) are uncertain
(4) disagree
(5) strongly disagree

Example: I write about important experiences. (strongly disagree) 5
Writing gives me a sense of achievement. (agree) 2

Questions: (Take your time and try to be as honest as possible)

1.	I avoid writing.	1._____
2.	I have no fear of my writing being evaluated.	2._____
3.	I look forward to writing down my ideas.	3._____
4.	I am afraid of writing essays.	4._____
5.	Taking a composition course is a very frightening experience.	5._____
6.	Handing in a composition makes me feel good.	6._____
7.	My mind seems to go blank when I start to work on a composition.	7._____
8.	Expressing ideas through writing seems to be a waste of time.	8._____
9.	I would enjoy submitting my writing to magazines for evaluation and publication.	9._____
10.	I like to write my ideas down.	10._____
11.	I like to have my friends read what I have written.	11._____
12.	I feel confident in my ability to clearly express my ideas in writing.	12._____
13.	I'm nervous about writing.	13._____
14.	People seem to enjoy what I write.	14._____
15.	I enjoy writing.	15._____
16.	I never seem to be able to clearly write down my ideas.	16._____
17.	Writing is a lot of fun.	17._____
18.	I expect to do poorly in a composition class even before I enter it.	18._____
19.	I like seeing my thoughts on paper.	19._____
20.	Discussing my writing with others is an enjoyable experience.	20._____
21.	I have a terrible time organizing my ideas in a composition class.	21._____
22.	When I handin a composition I know I'm going to do poorly.	22._____
23.	It's easy for me to write good compositions.	23._____
24.	I don't think I write as well as most other people.	24._____
25.	I don't like my compositions to be evaluated.	25._____
26.	I'm no good at writing.	26._____

APPENDIX E

CRITERIA FOR GRADING ESSAYS

	CONTENT	ORGANIZATION Rhetorical & Logical Development	SENTENCE STRUCTURE	DICTION	GRAMMAR PUNCTUATION SPELLING
7-5 (A-B)	A significant central idea clearly defined, and supported with concrete, substantial, and consistent relevant detail	Essay planned so that it progresses by clearly ordered and necessary stages, and developed with originality and consistent attention to proportion and emphasis; paragraphs coherent, unified, and effectively developed; transitions between paragraphs explicit and effective	Sentences skillfully constructed (unified, coherent, forceful, effectively varied)	Distinctive: fresh precise, economical, and idiomatic	Clarity and effectiveness of expression promoted by consistent use of standard grammar, punctuation, and spelling
4 (C)	Central idea apparent but trivial, or trite, or too general; supported with concrete detail, but detail that is occasionally repetitious, irrelevant, or sketchy	Plan and method of essay apparent but not consistently fulfilled; developed with only occasional disproportion or inappropriate emphasis; paragraphs unified, coherent, usually effective in their development; transitions between paragraphs clear but abrupt, mechanical, or monotonous	Sentences correctly constructed but lacking distinction	Appropriate: clear and idiomatic	Clarity and effectiveness of expression weakened by occasional deviations from standard grammar, punctuation and spelling

	CONTENT	ORGANIZATION	SENTENCE STRUCTURE	DICTION	GRAMMAR PUNCTUATION SPELLING
		Rhetorical & Logical Development			
3-1 (D-F)	Central idea lacking, or confused, or unsupported with concrete and relevant detail	Plan and purpose of essay not apparent, undeveloped or developed with irrelevance, redundancy, or inconsistency; paragraphs incoherent, not unified, or undeveloped; transitions between paragraphs unclear or ineffective	Sentences not unified, incoherent, fused, incomplete, monotonous or childish	Inappropriate vague, unidiomatic, or substandard	Communication obscured by frequent deviations from standard grammar, punctuation, and spelling

APPENDIX F

STUDENT I.D._____

COLLEGE WRITING, CORE 106 — ESSAY RATING SHEET

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. A thesis substantially developed (content)		✓					
2. Logical organization		✓					
3. Varied and forceful sentence structure				✓			
4. Precise, economical, and idiomatic diction				✓			
5. Correctness in spelling, punctuation, grammar and documentation	—			✓			

General Comment:

JOHN:

SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE IN SENTENCE STRUCTURE, DICTION, AND MECHANICS — BUT NOTE SERIOUS WEAKNESSES IN CONTENT AND ORGANIZATION (1+2):

1. YOUR CONTENT IS WEAKENED BY INSUFFICIENT SUPPORT OF YOUR THESIS. PROVIDE ILLUSTRATIVE DETA
2. NOTE THAT YOUR OPENING PARAGRAPH PROMISES A PLAN THAT YOU DO NOT FOLLOW IN YOUR PAPER.

APPENDIX G

SYLLABUS FOR RHETORIC, CORE 107

This is the second-level course in the freshman writing sequence. Students with a six-credit requirement in writing take this course after successful completion of Core 106, College Writing. Students with a three-credit requirement in writing take this course either in the fall or spring semester of freshman year.

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

1. Writing is best learned by writing.
2. Writing is rewriting: revision is essential to effective writing.
3. Talking about writing is not as productive as writing and rewriting.
4. Extensive and attentive reading supports good writing.
5. The content of the course is essentially what the student writes.
6. Students can be encouraged to learn by themselves and to exploit available resources (Learning Center, Library, Computer Center).
7. Word-processing and text-critiquing systems open up the possibility of improved student writing by encouraging revision and independent learning. (Applicable to sections using computers.)
8. The individual conference is one of the most valuable forms of writing instruction.
9. A knowledge of library tools and research techniques contributes to intellectual growth and to success in college.

IMMEDIATE AIMS

1. To give students additional practice in the writing of short essays which reflect:

    a. a clear sense of purpose
    b. a logical plan
    c. coherence
    d. a sense of audience
    e. fullness of development
    f. attention to the conventions of spelling, punctuation, grammar, and usage.

2. To give students instruction in library tools and research techniques.
3. To give students an understanding of the characteristics of valid argument.

4. To give students practice in the writing of a documented research paper.

ULTIMATE AIMS

1. to give the student a greater familiarity with the library as a resource for learning.
2. to give the student a greater sense of the value of written expression as part of the thinking and learning process.
3. to give the student a greater sense of the value of revision.
4. to give the student a greater sense of confidence in his writing ability.
5. to give the student a sense of the computer as a powerful tool for writing which he can make use of during his four years at college and beyond. (Applicable to sections using computers.)

REQUIREMENTS

1. Four essays of 500-750 words which require students to assimilate their readings. In addition, a research essay of 1500-1800 words. All essays will be revised.

   The student will submit only typed manuscripts.
   In sections using computers, students will print all essays, including drafts, on the computer.
   Handwritten manuscripts will not be accepted.

2. Readings from a collection of essays on contemporary subjects and issues. These essays will serve as models for discussion, examination, and the stimulation of student writing.
   The student will also be expected to do extensive reading of library materials in preparation of his research essay.

3. A mid-term and a final essay examination.
   These exams will test the student's ability to compose an essay having the qualities described above under "Immediate Aims."
   The final exam will be graded by two members of the Marist Writing Faculty, neither of whom is the course instructor.

4. Small-group activities.
   Teachers will ask students to write in class, to share their writing with others in groups, to collaborate in revision exercises or in the editing of each other's manuscripts.
   Students are expected to participate in such activities, and teachers will assign a portion of the grade to their participation.

5. NOTE ON ATTENDANCE:

Students are required to attend all classes, including scheduled conferences with instructor.
Students are also required to attend the special lecture in the theater, if one is scheduled.
A student who misses a class is expected to give the instructor an acceptable written explanation on his or her return to class.
Unexcused absences will result in a lowered grade.

GRADING:

A student's final grade will be based on the four essays (20%), the research essay (40%), the mid-term exam (10%), attendance and small-group participation (15%), and the final essay examination (15%).

TEXTS:

1. Behrens, Laurence, and Leonard Rosen, editors. WRITING AND READING ACROSS THE CURRICULUM. Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1982.

2. Corbett, John. THE LITTLE ENGLISH HANDBOOK. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1978.

3. Any college-level dictionary.

MATERIALS:

To be brought to each class or conference:

1. Texts
2. A writing folder
3. Handouts
4. Pen and paper

ADDITIONAL NOTES:

1. Except for emergencies, no papers will be accepted late.

2. Students are required to include a letter to the instructor with each writing project.

3. All papers should be stapled once in the upper left corner.

ESSAY ASSIGNMENTS FOR CORE 107

Students will have two weeks for each of the following essay assignments. A preliminary draft of the essay is due at the end of the first week, a revised draft at the end of the second week. All drafts must be carefully proofread.

Readings appear in WRITING AND READING ACROSS THE CURRICULUM, edited by Laurence Behrens and Leonard Rosen.

(1) Section 9, "A Woman's Role," pp. 352-410.

Given the changes in women's roles over the past twenty years, do you think women are worse off or better off today? Be sure to draw upon your readings.

(2) Section 11, "Nuclear War--Inevitable?", pp. 462-509.

Drawing upon your readings, defend one or two proposals for reducing the threat of nuclear war.

(3) Section 8, "Death and Dying," pp. 286-350.

Argue that current attitudes toward death are less mature, less healthy than earlier attitudes. Or, argue the opposite. Be sure to draw upon your readings.

(4) Section 12, Personality," pp. 511-549.

Can a formed personality be changed by an effort of will power? Drawing upon your readings and your observations, support your position.

(5) THE RESEARCH PAPER

The last six weeks of the semester will focus on the research paper and on related exercises. Students are to choose a research topic suggested by any one of the sections in WRITING AND READING ACROSS THE CURRICULUM. Students are required to make use of the bibliography at the end of that section and to supplement the bibliography by means of library research.

Students well submit a preliminary draft of the research paper after the third week of the six-week period. The final draft will be due three weeks later.

APPENDIX H

Division of Arts & Letters

Marist College

Dear Student:

Your answers to the following questions will assist your writing instructors in evaluating the effectiveness of Word-Processing in the College Writing Course. Thank you for your assistance.

1. I believe the greatest advantage of Word-Processing for me is:

   _____

   _____

2. I believe the greatest disadvantage of Word-Processing for me is:

   _____

   _____ *

3. I am glad that I was assigned to a computer section of College Writing this semester. Yes_____ No_____ Not Sure_____

   Please explain. _____

4. I have used the computer to write essays for other courses this semester. Yes_____ No_____

   If your answer is "yes", please list courses and number of essays composed on the computer.

   Course:_____ No. of Essays:_____

   Course:_____ No. of Essays:_____

   Course:_____ No. of Essays:_____

5. I have demonstrated Word-Processing to friends and relatives. Yes_____ No_____

   If answer is "yes", to how many individuals?_____

6. I think all freshmen should learn Word-Processing as part of their College Writing Course. Yes_____ No_____ Not Sure_____

7. I am pleased to have access to the computer for the rhetoric class next semester.

   Yes_____ No_____ Not Especially_____

* CONTINUE ON OTHER SIDE IF NECESSARY.